DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 025 JC 730 095

AUTHOR	Schonbuch, Stanley S.; And Others
TITLE	The Core Experience: A Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis.
INSTITUTION	City Univ. of New York, Staten Island, N.Y. Staten Island Community Coll.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	32p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; *Core Curriculum; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Locus of Control; Post Secondary Education; Program Descriptions; Questionnaires; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A Core Program was introduced in the College Discovery Program at Staten Island Community College in fall 1971 to facilitate the breakdown of traditional divisions between academic disciplines, promote greater intimacy in the classroom, and to help students perceive teachers in a more realistic way. Each core was comprised of freshman orientation, math, English, a social science (a different one in each of the four cores), and a core seminar. The variables assessed were grades, attitudes of students and teachers toward the core, and locus of control. Attitudes and locus of control were assessed via questionnaires two weeks after the beginning of the semester and a week prior to the end of the semester. The program did not appear to realize its goals; non-core students tended to rate their class experiences as better or more valuable than did the core students. While teacher ratings were higher quantitatively than their student ratings, their qualitative comments reflected a much more negative feeling. Student ratings of one of the cores reflected a better experience for them. The core experience tended to stimulate internal controls. Recommendations were made for: the formation of core faculty teams, selection of students and faculty on variables other than interest, and orientation programs and open discussion periods. Copies of the questionnaires are appended. (KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 075025

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE CORE EXPERIENCE

A QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

Stanley S. Schonbuch, Ph. D.
Barton S. Solomon, M. A.
Harris, Joseph R.
College Discovery Program

Staten Island Community College
715 Ocean Terrace
Staten Island, New York 10301

JC 730 095

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 18 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the past few months many informal conversations took place between the authors of this research and the College Discovery teaching and counseling faculty, without whose cooperation this project would not have been possible.

In addition, we want to express our special appreciation and gratitude to Charles Mercer and Carl Strandberg, College Discovery student-counselors, whose efforts were a major contribution to the completion of the study.

We also express our thanks to Dean Joseph Harris for his cooperation, encouragement, and support. His leadership in stimulating the need for empirical research has been indispensable.

INTRODUCTION

Briefly, a Core Program was introduced in the fall 1971 semester with the following rationale and objectives:

a) it would facilitate the breakdown of the traditional divisions between academic disciplines

b) it would promote greater intimacy in the classroom

c) it would help students perceive the teacher in a more realistic way, as a human being and not as an impersonal instructor

d) it would encourage a transfer of knowledge and enthusiasm between disciplines.

A Core is a prearranged block program of courses for which a student registers. Each core is comprised of Freshman Orientation, Mathematics, English, a Social Science (each of the four Cores contained a different one) and a Core Seminar. (See Appendix B)

Given the stated objectives of the Core Program an attempt was made to assess the following variables:

1) Communication in the classroom

   a) how many students contribute

   b) type of speech, questions, and comments, kind of opinion expressed

   c) direction of speech, - student to student, teacher to student, student to teacher

   d) duration of contact

2) Attendance

3) Grades

4) Attitudes of students and teachers toward the Core

   a) motivation for learning

   b) confidence in speaking out in class

   c) general attitudes about the Core

   d) relevance of courses and structure of classes

e) more self disclosure

f) faster recognition of academic shortcomings e.g. the need for remediation, tutorials, and intensive counseling.

In addition, a variable of more general educational interest was included. This variable called "locus of control" relates to an individual's perception of the relative importance of external or internal controls existing in regard to his or her life.

Implicit in the introduction and rationale of the Core is that its goals would be more easily achieved within the structure of a Core Program rather than within the traditional academic structure with its given divisions.

Accordingly, it was hypothesised by the authors of this paper that as compared to non-core classes, core classes would be characterized by the following:

1) a greater number of students contributing to classroom discussion for greater amount of total class time

2) a more open, relaxed, and honest exchange of thoughts and feelings between students, and between students and teachers

3) greater percentage of classroom attendance

4) higher grade-point averages

5) more positive attitudes by both students and teachers with regard to the following:

   a) motivation to learn

   b) perceived relevance of course structure

   c) honesty in the classroom

   d) interpersonal confidence

   e) self disclosure

   f) recognition of academic shortcomings e.g. tutoring, remedial needs, and intensive counseling.

6) Greater feeling of internal rather than external control over their lives and futures. In other words, the Core will enhance the students feelings about whether or not he has an impact on his own life and the educational process to which he relates.

PROCEDURE

The subjects participating in the study were all A) College Discovery students enrolled in the four Core Programs that were set up during the fall 1971 semester and B) College Discovery students enrolled in non-core programs during the same term. The latter group was included to serve for control purposes. Both groups were comprised primarily of freshman and for the most part were indistinguishable except for their status with regard to enrollment in the Core. Registration in the Core was encouraged but not mandatory for all incoming freshman students and so those freshmen controls who were not in the Core were those who chose or elected not to do so.

After the first two weeks of the fall 1971 semester questionnaires (refer to appendix A) were distributed by the classroom instructors during classtime. On this questionnaire each student was asked to rate on a scale of 1-5 his brief present classroom experience along 11 various dimensions. All subjects received similar attitude questionnaires with minor word or phrase changes reflecting their core or non-core status. Core and non-core instructors were also asked to rate qualitatively and quantitatively their perceptions of their classroom experience along these 11 dimensions.

In addition to the attitude questionnaire, a Locus of Control questionnaire (see appendix A) was also administered to all subjects for completion and collection during classtime. The same procedure with the identical questionnaires was followed one week prior to the end of the fall 1971 semester. The assessment of communication in class and attendance had to be abandoned. Measurement of the first variable was not possible at this time because a useable and reliable technique to monitor communication patterns was lacking. An attempt to hand record categories and direction of communication was made but proved to be extremely difficult because classroom activity often outpaced the observer's recording skills. Even with occasional accurate counting and detection of speech direction and duration of contact, it was not possible to do this and record type of speech simultaneously. Perhaps three or four observers and a tape recorder would be necessary for this type of operation.

Tracking of classroom attendance was hindered by differences in attendance practices among the instructors involved in the experiment. Uniform standards would be a prerequisite for appropriate inter-class comparisons.

RESULTS

A) Quantitative Section

Table I - Means and t Tests for Comparisons of End of Term Student Questionnaire Responses in Core and Non-Core Classes

Question	Core Mean	Non-Core Mean	t-Statistic
2	3.026	3.722	*2.5725
3	2.769	3.528	*2.3376
4	2.872	3.056	.6094
5	3.487	3.417	-.2375
6	3.179	3.528	1.0854
7	3.077	3.083	.0180
8	2.821	3.056	.7353
9	3.538	3.250	-.9559
10	2.949	3.389	1.9117
11	3.077	2.833	-.7458
12	2.462	2.306	-.4568

* significant at $p < .05$ level

The data indicates that the non-core students rated their classes significantly higher on questions #2 and 3 than did the Core students. Student question #2 deals with the relevancy of the courses to students needs and #3 with whether the course structure is conducive to social accessibility. There is also a non-significant trend for non-core students to feel that they make more important contributions to the class than core students feel they make.

Table II - Means and t Tests for Comparison of Individual End of Term Core Student Questionnaire Responses with the Total Non-Core Group

	Question	Core I Mean	Total Non-Core Mean	t-Statistic
Section I	2	2.846	3.722	*2.4604
	3	2.385	3.528	*2.6419
	4	2.615	3.056	1.0495
	5	3.077	3.417	.8064
	6	2.538	3.528	*2.2576
	7	2.538	3.083	1.0909
	8	2.538	3.056	1.1875
	9	3.077	3.250	.3916
	10	2.692	3.389	*2.0601
	11	2.846	2.833	-.0276
	12	1.769	2.306	1.1601

	Question	Core II Mean	Total Non-Core Mean	t-Statistic
Section II	2	3.077	3.722	1.5466
	3	3.231	3.528	.7067
	4	2.846	3.056	.4741
	5	4.154	3.417	-1.8609
	6	4.154	3.528	-1.5351
	7	3.692	3.083	-1.1902
	8	3.000	3.056	.1270
	9	3.923	3.250	-1.5407
	10	3.000	3.389	1.1824
	11	3.231	2.833	-.8285
	12	2.769	2.306	-.9827

	Question	Core III Mean	Total Non-Core Mean	t-Statistic
Section III	2	3.154	3.722	1.4300
	3	2.692	3.528	*2.0076
	4	3.154	3.056	-.2278
	5	3.231	3.417	.4322
	6	2.846	3.528	1.4843
	7	3.000	3.083	.1607
	8	2.923	3.056	.3084
	9	3.615	3.250	-.8079
	10	3.154	3.389	.6889
	11	3.154	2.833	-.6836
	12	2.846	2.306	-1.0954

* significant at $p < .05$ level

Data in Table II suggests that Core I students as compared to a combined average of non-core students rated their classes significantly lower on four variables (questions #2,3,6 and 10). There is a trend for this core to score lower on six of the remaining seven variables. Core III students compared with the combined non-core average, score statistically significantly lower on question 3. There is a trend for them to score lower on six of the remaining ten variables. These differences were not statistically significant. In contrast, the Core II group scored higher than the combined non-core total on six of eleven variables.

Table III - Means and t Tests for Comparison of End of Term Faculty Questionnaire Responses in Core and Non-Core Classes

Question	Core Mean	Non-Core Mean	t-Statistic
2	3.778	4.429	1.3264
3	4.000	3.571	-.9297
4	3.333	3.286	-.0802
5	3.667	3.714	.1151
6	3.444	2.714	-1.3703
7	3.556	3.571	.0418
8	3.556	2.571	-1.3354
9	3.444	3.857	.7015
10	3.889	2.286	*-2.5196
11	3.222	1.714	*-3.3781

* significant at $p < .05$ level

Data suggests that core faculty rate their classes significantly higher than non-core faculty on two variables 1) the students personal and social confidence in a group situation and 2) confidence in his or her relating to the opposite sex within a group situation. There is also a trend, though not significant, for core faculty as compared to non-core faculty to perceive their classes as positively effecting student attendance and student-faculty relationships to a greater extent. Data on the remaining six questions yields trends in favor of the non-core classes.

Table IV - Means and t Tests for Comparison of Core Faculty VS Core Students End of Term Questionnaire Responses

Question	Faculty Mean	Student Mean	t-Statistic
2	3.778	3.026	-1.8681
3	4.000	2.769	*-2.2696
4	3.333	2.872	-1.0092
5	3.667	3.487	-.4123
6	3.444	3.077	-.7312
7	3.556	2.821	-1.4540
8	3.556	3.538	-.0386
9	3.444	2.949	-1.4009
10	3.889	3.077	-1.7352
11	3.222	2.462	-1.5291

*significant at $p < .05$ level

The data indicates that when the core faculty is compared to the core student group, the former perceive their classes as more signi icantly facilitating interpersonal contact. In fact, there is a trend for the core faculty when compared with their core students to rate their classes higher on all ten variables.

Table V - Means and t Tests for Comparison of Non-Core Faculty VS Non-Core Students End of Term Questionnaire Responses

Question	Faculty Mean	Student Mean	t-Statistic
2	4.429	3.722	-1.4262
3	3.571	3.528	-.0899
4	3.286	3.056	-.4167
5	3.714	3.417	-.5671
6	2.714	3.083	.5605
7	3.571	3.056	-1.0188
8	2.571	3.250	1.1183
9	3.857	3.389	-1.0326
10	2.286	2.833	.8735
11	1.714	2.306	.9822

Although the data does not indicate statistically significant differences, there is a tendency for non-core faculty as compared to non-core students to rate their classes higher on six out of ten variables.

Table VI - End of Term Locus of Control Means and t Test for Core VS Non-Core Students

Core Mean	Non-Core Mean	t-Statistic
10.119	11.200	1.0839

With regard to locus of control, there is a statistically non-significant trend for non-core students to score higher on this variable. A higher score reflects an orientation in the direction of external rather than internal control of one's actions or behaviors.

Table VII - Means and t Test for Comparison of End of Term Responses for each Core VS Total Non-Core

Section	Core Mean	Non-Core Mean	t-Statistic
1	11.000	11.200	.1446
2	10.929	11.200	.2049
3	8.000	11.200	*2.1563

* significant at p< .05 level

The data in this table indicates that Core III students as compared to a combined non-core student average, scored significantly lower on the locus of control test, indicating that this particular core seemed to be developing internal controls. In contrast, Cores I and II did not differ significantly from the combined non-core average. However, there is a moderate trend indicating that the core does seem to stimulate internal control as is also evidenced on Table Six.

Table VIII - Means and t Test for Comparison of Core and Non-Core Faculty on Changes from Time 1 - Time 2

Question	Core Mean	Non-Core Mean	t-Statistic
2	.125	-1.000	*-1.9847
3	-.250	-.400	-.2668
4	-.375	.400	-.0437
5	.750	-1.200	*-3.0000
6	.125	.200	.1575
7	-.250	-.200	.0769
8	.750	.000	-.8321
9	.125	-1.400	*-2.5532
10	-.125	-.200	-.0984
11	.125	.200	.1038

* significant at p< .05 level

Table VIII is a comparison of change over time (pre and post semester) for core and non-core faculty on ten variables. The data indicates a substantial trend for the non-core faculty in the direction of greater change of opinion regarding the positive effects of their classes. On three variables, questions # 2, 5, and 9 this difference in favor of the non-core faculty is statistically significant.

Table IX - Means and t Test for Comparison of Class Academic Averages for Core and Non-Core Classes

Group	Department	Mean
C	Speech	1.786
C	Speech	2.545
C	Speech	3.143
C	History	1.375
C	Math	2.222
C	Sociology	2.846
C	English	2.905
C	English	2.182
C	Math	3.077
C	Economics	2.036
C	English	1.852
C	Government	2.417
C	Math	3.333
C	Math	2.125
C	English	2.950
C	Speech	2.692
N	Economics	2.000
N	Math	1.923
N	English	3.000
N	Speech	3.250
N	Government	2.667

C=Core
N=Non-Core

Total Core Mean	Total Non-Core Mean	t-Statistic
2.468	2.568	.3452

The data suggests no statistically significant difference between student grades for core and non-core classes.

RESULTS

B) Qualitative Section

I) Student Questionnaires - Core

1. The Core structure serves as a good introduction to the college freshman. Special emphasis was placed on the following:

   a) Freshman Orientation
   b) Tutorials
   c) Seminars

2. The students seem to feel and act more openly in their core classes. This seems to be due to the feeling that students have the opportunity to become more familiar in the core.

3. Some students feel that the core tends to isolate them and that there are few possibilities of meeting other students.

4. The schedule is not flexible enough.

5. Reminds some students of high school where they had the same students in all their classes.

6. Core courses were quite relevant. (Opinion of the majority.)

7. Some students felt that the core structure was not that important but it is the teacher that makes the difference.

8. Core seems to be more appropriate for the withdrawn type of student. Outspoken and extroverted types feel slowed down by the limitation of the core structure.

Student Questionnaires - Non-Core

1. A high percentage of non-core students liked the College Discovery faculty, environment, and overall atmosphere of the college.

2. Courses are considered to be somewhat relevant to educational needs.

3. About 20% of the students tend to feel isolated because they are not part of the core. They seem to miss the interaction that the core has to offer.

4. Class attendance as well as class participation seems based on the teacher-student relationship and the students perception of whether or not the class is relevant.

5. Non-core students did not rate their classes as high as core students in reference to the student-teacher relationship.

II) Faculty Questionnaires - Core

1. Core teachers must have better coordination and more frequent meetings between the interdisciplinaries.

   a) Core teachers should meet at least once a week to interrelate their materials, ideas and suggestions.

   b) These meetings can be effective in spotting students with deficiencies and correlating the specific efforts to correct these deficiencies.

   c) Better scheduling of core teachers is needed to make sure all core faculty can attend these meetings.

2. Core faculty should be checked for personality or teaching methods that may add conflicts in the core block structure.

   a) Teachers within the core groups "must be able to work together". This problem arose in the core and seemed to be more of a personality conflict than a difference of teaching methods.

   b) More time should be spent before the semester begins to meet and work out differences and to achieve greater interrelatedness in courses.

Faculty Questionnaires - Non-Core

1. "I relate material directly to students personal experiences."

2. Informal classes are needed for a meaningful educational experience.

3. In non-core the students seem less outgoing.

4. The non-core structure seems the same as other small classes.

5. Teachers can spot deficiencies and help students before or after class on an individual basis.

6. The teachers must create an atmosphere of trust, concern and confidence - the student usually responds to this approach. Students only speak when they want to.

7. No clear affect on students attitudes as far as coming to classes.

8. The relationship between student and teacher is largely the responsibility of the instructor - they must be willing to be open, honest and concerned for the student.

9. Interreaction level seems to constantly improve.

DISCUSSION

One interpretation of the fall 1971 core experience, as evidenced by the obtained quantitative and qualitative results of this study, is that the core experience may not have fully realized the goals, hopes, and plans of the College Discovery faculty. With some exceptions non-core students, as compared with core students, tended to rate their class experiences as better or more valuable.

Core teacher ratings and comments of their classes seem to reflect an ambivalence or dissonance with regard to the effectiveness of the core experience. While their quantitative ratings were higher than their student ratings on the same variables, their qualitative comments reflected a much more negative feeling. It was as though faculty were, on one level, willing to acknowledge the deficiencies of the core experience but at the same time were unwilling to quantify this feeling. It was as though the lower rating might mirror a loss of commitment and personal investment in the core. Interestingly, non-core faculty also tend to rate their classes more positively than their students. One possible explanation for this finding is that there is a general tendency for all faculty to overestimate, as compared to students, the impact they make on students, especially if there is some personal investment and need to defend what they are doing. This discrepancy in perceptions may account, in part, for occasional faculty midterm and end of term "blues", when student grades (feedback) do not substantiate their perceptions and expectations as to what has been the student experience in class.

An alternative or additional explanation of the core faculty-student discrepancy is the possibility that core students under-estimated the value of the core because of a generally negative and anxious reaction to being placed in a novel experimental situation. Qualitative data obtained from students also suggests an additional interpretation. The core student responses can be separated into two broad categories. One group of students felt that the core can be of assistance to withdrawn and introverted types, to help them feel more at ease in a group situation and to encourage more stimulating student-teacher relationships. However, another group felt that the bright, eager student, the kind of individual who is outspoken in a group situation may be slowed down and restricted by the same group. There is a genuine concern that the lack of diversity of student views and minimal contact with the larger student body may dampen and seriously curtail their educational experience. The quantitative ratings of these groups may have cancelled each other out and resulted in a trend for an overall lower rating (compared with core faculty) of the core classes.

As a parallel interpretation to core teacher reaction to their experiences, the tendency for non-core faculty as compared to core faculty to rate their classes higher may not be related to an actual difference but a function of the former feeling that they, perhaps, were involved in something far less significant than the core faculty.

While there was a trend for non-core students to outrate their core counterparts on seven of eleven variables (two significantly so) the student ratings of one of the cores reflect a different and better experience for them as compared to the other core students. This finding suggests that possibly the individual teacher makes a greater contribution to the class experience than other important variables such as the structure or physical, or even psychological characteristics of the classroom situation.

In terms of class ratings on the eleven variables from highest to lowest the following order was obtained: non-core faculty, core faculty, non-core students, core students.

Finally, it is important to note that the core experience tends to stimulate internal controls. Thus, the student feels he has more of an impact on his own life and the educational process. Hopefully, this would eventually develop and enhance responsible educational decision making.

Before stating recommendations some comments on the questionnaire and their usage is necessary. It was brought to the attention of the authors of this paper that the questionnaire had several faulty items. The authors fully acknowledge it's limitations and shortcomings. The wording of some questions was poor, ambiguous, and misleading. For example, on one question non-core faculty were asked to compare their experience with that of the core without prior experience in the core. While it is possible to offer some argument in defense, these writers feel that the criticism is justified.

In addition, as with all self-report measures the question of honesty can always be raised. If people feel that answers to questions can threaten personal and/or social-economic security their responses can be suspect. While it is not our opinion that this contributed significantly, it is, nevertheless, something to be considered.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While on the one hand, data suggests that the core experience may have yielded less than expected rewards for the fall 1971 semester, we are left with many alternative explanations for the obtained results. Factors, among others, such as possible student personality differences in the core, faculty defensiveness and ambivalence with regard to the concepts of the core and validity of the questionnaire and the responses it rendered, raise more questions about the core rather than aid in evaluating the previous experience or the concept of the core itself.

With these findings in mind, the following recommendations are made:

1. The core should be continued with much more attention given to the formation of core faculty teams. Such a procedure or process is necessary to form teams that can work together efficiently and harmoniously.

2. A method or procedure is necessary to select core students on personality variables i.e. introvert-extrovert types, as well as expressed interest in the particular experience.

3. Orientation programs are necessary for both students and faculty as to the goals and philosophy of the core before registration in the core. The orientation for students should also allow for an airing of issues and problems of experimental programs so that anxiety in this area can be effectively dealt with before it becomes an interference in the process. For faculty, the orientation program should be a beginning toward creating an atmosphere in the program in which all feel they are contributing significantly.

4. The discrepancy between faculty-student perceptions of the impact of the class experience could probably be best dealt with by opening discussion periodically in the classroom between students and teacher so that their perceptions could be more in line or congruent with reality. Perhaps, the truth lies somewhere between their two discrepant perceptions.

5. Possibly, some process other than one of self selection should be a guide to the original pool (pre-team formation) of probable core teachers. As with other things, people are not equally prepared professionally or personally for a core experience.

Appendix A

Questionnaires

Core Student Questionnaire

Circle one of the numbers 1 - 5 indicating the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question.

1 = very little
5 = very much

1. Generally speaking do you like the core?

1 2 3 4 5

Why?

2. Do you feel your courses are relevant?

1 2 3 4 5

Why?

3. Does the structure of the core help you to meet other students?

1 2 3 4 5

How?

4. Has the core helped you to pinpoint areas in which you are having difficulty such as poor study skills, etc.?

1 2 3 4 5

How has it done this?

5. Has the core affected your inclination to speak out in a group situation?

1 2 3 4 5

5. (continued)

In what way?

6. Have you participated more in class discussion here than in High School?

1 2 3 4 5

7. Has the core affected your attitudes about coming to class?

1 2 3 4 5

→ How?

8. Do you think that being in the core affects your desire and excitement about learning?

1 2 3 4 5

9. Has the core affected the way in which students relate to teacher and teacher to student?

1 2 3 4 5

In what way?

10. Do you feel that others in your class think you have important things to say?

    1 2 3 4 5

    How do you know?

11. Has the core affected your confidence in a group situation?

    1 2 3 4 5

12. Has the core affected your confidence in relating to the opposite sex?

    1 2 3 4 5

13. In general, what are the advantages of the core?

14. In general, what are the disadvantages?

Non-Core

Student Questionnaire

(1) Circle one of the numbers 1-5 indicating the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question.

1 = very little
5 = very much

1. Generally speaking, do you like being a student at SICC?

1 2 3 4 5

Why?

2. Do you feel your courses are relevant?

1 2 3 4 5

Why?

3. Does the structure of the class help you to meet other students?

1 2 3 4 5

How?

4. Have your courses helped you to pinpoint areas in which you are having difficulty such as poor study skills, etc.

1 2 3 4 5

How has it done this?

5. Have your courses affected your inclination to speak out in a group situation?

1 2 3 4 5

In what way?

6. Have you participated more in class discussion than in High School?

1 2 3 4 5

7. Have your courses affected your attitudes about coming to class?

1 2 3 4 5

How?

8. Do you think that your courses affect your desire and excitement?

1 2 3 4 5

9. Have your courses affected the ways in which students relate to teachers and teachers to students:

1 2 3 4 5

In what way?

10. Do you feel that others in your class think you have important things to say?

1 2 3 4 5

How do you know?

11. Have your courses affected your confidence in a group situation?

1 2 3 4 5

12. Have your courses affected your confidence in relating to the opposite sex?

1 2 3 4 5

Non-Core Faculty Questionnaire

Circle one of the numbers 1-5, indicating the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question.

1 = very little 5 = very much

2. As compared to the core, does the structure of your courses create a meaningful educational experience?

1 2 3 4 5

Why?

3. Does the non-core structure of classes have an impact on students interpersonal relationships?

1 2 3 4 5

How?

4. Has the non-core structure of classes helped to pinpoint the educational deficiencies of students?

1 2 3 4 5

How has it done this?

5. Has the non-core structure of classes affected students' inclination to speak out in class?

1 2 3 4 5

In what way?

7. Do you find that non-core classes affect student attitudes about coming to class?

1 2 3 4 5

How?

8. How would you rate your students' motivation to learn?

1 2 3 4 5

Why?

9. Have the non-core structure of classes affected traditional student-faculty relationships?

   1 2 3 4 5

   In what way?

10. Do you find that students in the non-core classes are affecting each other to a great extent?

    1 2 3 4 5

    How do you know?

11. Has the non-core class structure affected the students confidence in a group situation?

    1 2 3 4 5

12. Has the non-core class structure affected the students' confidence in relating to the opposite sex?

    1 2 3 4 5

Core Faculty Questionnaire

Circle one of the numbers 1-5, indicating the strength or weakness of your agreement with the question.

1 = very little 5 = very much

1. Generally speaking, how do you feel about the core?

2. Will the core create a meaningful education experience?

   1 2 3 4 5

   Why?

3. Has the core had an impact on students interpersonal relationships?

   1 2 3 4 5

   How?

4. Has the core helped to pinpoint the educational deficiencies of students?

   1 2 3 4 5

   How has it done this?

5. Has the core affected student's inclination to speak out in class?

   1 2 3 4 5

   In what way?

7. Has the core affected student attitude about coming to class?

   1 2 3 4 5

   How?

8. Has the core affected the students motivation to learn?

   1 2 3 4 5

   Why?

9. Has the core affected traditional student-faculty relationships?

   1 2 3 4 5

   In what way?

10. Do you find that students in the core are affecting each other to a great extent?

    1 2 3 4 5

    How do you know?

11. Has the core affected the students confidence in a group situation?

    1 2 3 4 5

12. Has the core affected the students confidence in relating to the opposite sex?

13. In general, what are the advantages of the core?

14. In general, what are the disadvantages of the core?

Internal-External Locus of Control

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.

   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.

   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.

   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.

   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.

   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.

   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.

   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.

   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.

   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.

    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

    b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.

    b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.

    b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.

    b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.

    b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.

    b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.

    b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.

    b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.

    b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.

    b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.

    b. Most mistortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.

    b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.

    b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.

    b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their job are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.

    b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.

    b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.

    b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.

    b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life it taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.

    b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

Appendix B

Core Sections and Schedules

Core Curriculum A

History 29 AC
Speech 1 DE
English 11 BCE
Math 15 GH
XF4BF

Core Curriculum B

English 11 DE
Speech 1 FH2
Sociology 5 BCE
Math 15 JK1
XF4EF1

Core Curriculum C

Economics 1 PS
English 11 NQ
Speech 1 M
Math 15 JK2
XF4EF2

Core Curriculum D

English 11 GHK
Speech 1 FH1
Math 5 NQ
Government 1 JK
XF4JM